MC SRIEFING

STERET

1 NOVEMBER 1956

MINISARY AND POLAND

- I. In Hungary, Seviet treops at last withdrawing from Budapest, as Shukov told Bohlon they would. Now, uneasy conlition between some of multiple "revolutionary committees" and Magy regime is trying to take over. "Revolutionaries" clearly have upper hand.
 - A. Hagy has agreed to form now army, from insurgent units, under command of "Revolutionary Armed Forces Committee."
 - B. Hagy is also forming now welti-party government, has promised future free elections and has asked withdrawal from Varenw Past.
 - C. Now provisional government will be under compulsion to heed wishes of insurgents, who will hold military control.
- II. Noncew announced 30 Oct now prepared discuss troop withdrawals from Poland and Russmin, as well as Mungary.
 - A. Seviet troops normally stationed in Bungary probably will now return to garrisons, sit there until ordered out of country.
 - B. Units in Bangary from Rumania and USSR (at least 1 div. each) may be withdrawing to normal stations already.
- III. Internally, various Hungarian insurgent forces and "committees" represent whole spectrum political views...from "national" Communist to elearly anti-Communist."
 - A. Thus, incurgents had only two primary bases for unity; joint action in upriming and joint desire for Bungarian independence (including immediate Seviet troop withdrawal from entire country).

DOCUMENT NO.

NO CHANGE IN GUASS. EL

CHANGE IN GUASS. EL

CHANGED TO: TS S C

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Approved For Release 2001/08/14-CHA-RDP79R008904600800010001-7

Approved for Release 2001/08/14 : CIA-RDP79R00890A000800010001-7

IV. In addition to basic demands -- Rungarian independence and Seviet troop withdrawal -- insurgents called for:

End of symbols of Seviet control, e.g. red star and replacement with national symbols, e.g. KossuthPecat-of-arms.

Liquidation Communist security and secret police.

Condition government.

Free elections.

- A. By 30 Oct, regime had premised to meet all these demands.
- B. Regime has not yet coumitted itself specifically on certain questions of time--had dedged dates for Seviet treep withdrawal, helding free elections.

- v. In Poland, although Gosulka has reiterated several times that first and ferement interest is maintaining friendly alliance with USSR, new Polish Government does not feel bound to act in consert with USSR on fereign policy.
 - A. Cli report states that Bemile, mistresting Stalinist leftovers in his fereign service, wants to arrange private contact with the US government.
 - B. Demostically, Goomlks has started on measures to improve let of average Pole, thus gaining support for regime. These include:
 - 1. New electoral law.
 - ii. End to unjust judicial procedures.
 - 111. End to coursive collectivization.
 - iv. Steps toward seconsedation with the Church.
- VI. Moseev's 30 Oct offer negotiate withdrawal for troops from Satellites may be the little too late.
 - A. Beviet leaders confused and unrealistic: Ehrushchev is blaming Polish and Bungarian difficulties on their excessive rate of industrialisation, claiming USSE had warned against this.
 - B. Ehukev teld Boblen on 29 Oct Soviets could have "crushed Peles like flice" but had shown great restraint. Conversation confirmed that Soviets seriously considered force in Poland.
 - C. Meletor told Bohlen that Hungary illustrated what "small erganized group" could do, that masses rarely took any initiative of their own.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/08/14 : CIA-RDP79R00890A000800010001-7

VII. 30 Oct declaration amounts almost to capitalation.

- A. That Seviet leaders did not intend it to be capitulation is evidenced by:
 - i. great emphasis placed on Warsaw Pact as accessary to protect Communist system.
 - 11. Pointed omission of East Germany from list of countries where continued presence of Soviet troops subject to agetistion.
- B. However, declaration unlikely to influence course of nationalist tide among both Communists and non-Communists in Poland and Mangary.
- C. This ugly picture puts considerable strain on New "collective leadership.
- D. Khrushekev and Bulganin more subject to criticism than Moletov, who opposed Eastern European policy, or Enganevich.

